

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given to this application. Reconsideration is now respectfully requested in view of the amendment above and the following remarks.

Claims 47-49 and 51-92 are pending in this application. Claim 47 is the sole independent claim. Claims 1-46 and 50 were previously cancelled without prejudiced or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection

Entry of the Amendment is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not present any additional claims without canceling the corresponding number of final rejected claims; and/or c) places the application in better form for an appeal, if an appeal is necessary. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 41, 48, 91 and 92 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory, obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1, 2, 20 and 21 of copending App. No. 11/091,217. (Applicants presume that the intention was to list Claim 47, rather than (cancelled) Claim 41.) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

First, Applicants note that Claim 2 of App. No. 11/091,217 was cancelled.

Second, App. No. 11/091,217 remains pending and is currently under final rejection.

Third, the claims of App. No. 11/091,217 are directed to the distribution of digital video sequences, whereas, e.g., Claim 47 is directed to “secured distribution of at least one digital fixed picture in an original stream...in a nominal compressed format based on wavelets.” The claims of App. No. 11/091,217 are thus directed to a different type of content, and they also do not involve the use of wavelets.

Finally, Applicants note that the Office Action has provided no rationale for the rejections of Claims 2, 91, and 92. Therefore, it is further submitted that these claims are improperly rejected.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this provisional double-patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 47-49, 57, 62-64, 70-75, 78 and 91-92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,042 to Shin (hereinafter “Shin”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0198403 to Ottesen (hereinafter “Ottesen”), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,699 to Sasaki et al. (hereinafter “Sasaki et al.”). Claims 51-54, 58-61 and 76-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin, in view of Ottesen, in further view of Sasaki et al., and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,321,625 to Zhang (hereinafter “Zhang”). Claims 79-90 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin, in view of Ottesen, in further view of Sasaki et al., and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0118859 to Stone (hereinafter “Stone”). Claims 55 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin, in view of Ottesen, in further view of Sasaki et al., and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0133830 to Kim (hereinafter “Kim”). Claims 65-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin, in view of Ottesen, in further view of Sasaki et al., and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,421,082 to Kamiya (hereinafter “Kamiya”). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants note that there is only a single independent claim, Claim 47, which has been rejected based on the combination of Shin, Ottesen, and Sasaki et al. Among other things, Claim 47 includes the following recitations:

generating complementary information including modified information from the original stream, the complementary information also including functions for reconstructing the original stream with the modified information; and
transmitting the modified stream and the complementary information to an addressee equipment for reconstruction of the original stream from the modified

stream and the complementary information, wherein the reconstruction is adaptive and progressive as a function of information associated with a digital profile of the addressee equipment provided in the complementary information.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of references fails to teach or suggest at least these elements of Claim 47.

At page 5 the Office Action states, in connection with Shin:

But did not explicitly disclose generating complementary information including modified information from the original stream, the complementary information also including functions for reconstructing the original stream with the modified information; and transmitting the modified stream and the complementary information to an addressee equipment for reconstruction;

the original reconstructed stream from the modified stream and the complementary information, wherein the reconstruction is adaptive and progressive as a function of information associated with a digital profile of the addressee equipment provided in the complementary information.

Office Action at 5.

The Office Action then proceeds to allege the following:

However, Ottesen et al disclose generating complementary information including modified information from the original stream, the complementary information also including functions for reconstructing the original stream with the modified information; and transmitting the modified stream and the complementary information to an addressee equipment for reconstruction (see fig.1; Restore module 150 calculates complementary component data from the current iterated approximation, combines it with the received transformed component data, and takes an inverse transform to convert the data to the base domain of the original image, 0033; that means the modified data and the complementary data were transmitted together to the user).

Office Action at 5. Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Ottesen. The cited portion of Ottesen (i.e., paragraph 0033) reads as follows:

Restore module 150 calculates complementary component data from the current iterated approximation, combines it with the received transformed component data, and takes an inverse transform to convert the data to the base domain of the original image. Line 151 represents iteration through the module. Module 150 reinserts the known marker value(s) and padding at the correct locations in the image data during every iteration, so as to coerce convergence toward the correct image. It may also scale or otherwise manipulate the iteration data. Storage 160 holds the transformed image from channel 140, and initial and interim data representing the iterated restored image. It may also hold parameters such as markers and pad locations.

Ottesen at paragraph 0033. As stated in the first sentence of this paragraph, "Restore module 150 calculates complementary component data from the current iterated approximation." Therefore, contrary to the allegation in the Office Action, the "complementary component data" is not transmitted; it is calculated by restore module 150, which is at the receive side of the system of Ottesen. This "complementary component data" is calculated based on approximated data computed by the restore module 150. This understanding of Ottesen is further supported by Fig. 4 and paragraph 0041 of Ottesen, where it is stated, "Fig. 4 implements one of a number of methods for restoring a modified image from only a component of data in a transform domain. Software or hardware modules 150-160, Fig. 1, may carry out method 400." Ottesen at paragraph 0041. Therefore, it is clear that Ottesen's "complementary component data" was not transmitted and thus cannot correspond to the claimed "complementary information."

Furthermore, the claim language also recites, "the complementary information also including functions for reconstructing the original stream with the modified information." Nowhere, in the cited portions of Ottesen or anywhere else that Applicants have found in Ottesen is any such function suggested or disclosed. Therefore, again, Ottesen fails to teach the claimed "complementary information."

The Office Action then proceeds to allege the following:

And Sasaki et al disclose the original reconstructed stream from the modified stream and the complementary information, wherein the reconstruction is adaptive and

progressive as a function of information associated with a digital profile of the addressee equipment provided in the complementary information (a digital work with a license issued for a specific user cannot be reproduced in a reproducing unit of a user other than the specific user, col.12, lines 5-7).

Office Action at 5-6. However, the Office Action fails to explain how Sasaki et al. addresses, “wherein the reconstruction is adaptive and progressive.” The cited portion of Sasaki et al. (col. 12, lines 5-7) merely discusses, “a digital work with a license issued for a specific user cannot be reproduced in a reproducing unit of a user other than the specified user.”

Applicants have reviewed the cited references and have not found any further teachings or suggestions that would address the above deficiencies. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not support a rejection of Claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Furthermore, because all of the other claims depend from Claim 47, and Applicants have found no teachings or suggestions in any of the cited references that would address the above deficiencies in the combination of Chin et al., Ottesen, and Sasaki et al., Applicants respectfully submit that rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of all of the other pending claims are also not supported by the cited references.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Disclaimer

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-01110-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 13, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Jeffrey W. Gluck/
Jeffrey W. Gluck
Registration No.: 44,457
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 572-0322 (Direct Dial)
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant